RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL: The Forest Supervisor of the Coconino National Forest, Supervisor's Office 2323 E. Greenlaw Lane, Flagstaff AZ 86004, will decide what actions are most appropriate for managing the Buck Springs Range Allotment.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Cathy Taylor, Interdisciplinary Team Leader, Blue Ridge Ranger District, (520) 477–2255.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposal will issue a grazing permit for 634 cow/calf pairs and 8 horses. Annual Operating Plan would adjust the number of livestock allowed per year to resource conditions. The grazing strategy would be a deferred rotation system, with season of use running from about May 15 to October 15. Fencing, livestock trailing, water improvements, cattleguards, and riders would be used to manage the distribution of livestock and forage utilization, to avoid livestock grazing in some meadows and riparian areas, and to increase livestock control in sensitive areas. Approximately 22 miles of fence would be constructed, to split three pastures, exclude six meadows, and protect two springs. Dense thickets of small trees that currently impede the gathering of livestock would be precommercially thinned on 1500 acres to improve livestock movement, increase the understory diversity, reduce the risk of wildfire, and improve tree growth and

Preliminary issues include the effects of grazing on the environment, especially headwater meadows, and effects on species protected under the Endangered Species Act, specifically the Little Colorado spinedace and the

Mexican spotted owl. The environmental analysis process for the Buck Springs Range Allotment was initiated on June 25, 1998. An Interdisciplinary Team of Forest Service resource specialists, and representatives from the Arizona Game and Fish Department, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, and the allotment permittee, developed a guiding document for watershed recovery before undertaking an analysis of the allotment. They described the many factors affecting watershed conditions within the allotment, including elk and livestock grazing, recreation, transportation system, and introduced aquatic species. In a cooperative effort, the agencies making up the team developed the East Clear Creek Watershed Recovery Strategy for the Little Colorado Spinedace and Other Riparian Species to address many of

those factors. Using the document to guide actions proposed for the Buck Springs Range Allotment, the Team developed objectives and proposed management practices for the allotment.

The resulting Proposed Action was mailed to 209 individuals, organizations and cooperating resource agencies for review and comment in April 1999. From comments received, the Team developed statements to capture the substantive issues and developed 6 additional alternatives other than the proposed action. If you commented during this scoping period, these comments are already incorporated into the analysis. Some of these alternatives differ in grazing strategies, utilization levels, permitted numbers of livestock, pastures utilized, and improvements required, and are briefly described as follows:

- Proposed action as discussed above.
- No graze for a 10-year period.

• Continue current grazing management (no action).

- Continue deferred rotation and rely heavily on herding to affect distribution of livestock and to protect sensitive riparian and headwater meadow habitats.
- Continue deferred rotation and emphasize the use of northern tier of pastures, with most southern pastures that include headwater meadows removed from the grazing land base.
- Implement a rest-rotation strategy, where one-half of the allotment is grazed each year. Distribution of livestock and use of sensitive drainages are addressed primarily through range improvements.
- Implement a rest-rotation strategy on the northern tier of pastures. Southern pastures with headwater meadows are removed from the grazing land base.

It is anticipated that environmental analysis and preparation of the draft and final environmental impact statements will take about six months. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement can be expected March of 2001 and the Final EIS in summer. The comment period on the draft environmental impact statement extends 45 days from the date the Environmental Protection Agency publishes the notice of availability in the **Federal Register**.

The Forest Service believes, at this early stage, it is important to give reviewers notice of several court rulings related to public participation in the environmental review process. To be the most helpful, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible and may address the adequacy of the statement or the merits of the alternatives discussed

(see Council of Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3).

In addition, Federal court decisions have established that reviewers of draft environmental impact statements must structure their participation in the environmental review of the proposal so that it is meaningful and alerts an agency to the reviewers' position and contentions. Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp v. NRDC, 435 US 519, 553 (1978). Environmental objections that could have been raised at the draft stage may be waived if not raised until after completion of the final environmental impact statement. City of Angoon v. Hodel, 9th Circuit, (1986) and Wisconsin Heritages, Inc. v. Harris, 490 F. Supp. 1334, 1338 (E.D. Wis. 1980). The reason for this is to ensure that substantive comments and objections are made available to the Forest Service at a time when it can meaningfully consider them in the final environmental impact statement.

To assist the Forest Service in identifying and considering issues and concerns on the proposed action, comments on the draft environmental impact statement should be as specific as possible. It is also helpful if comments refer to specific pages or chapters of the draft statement. Comments may also address the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement or the merits of the alternatives formulated and discussed in the statement. Reviewers may wish to refer to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act at 40 CFR 1503.3 in addressing these points.

Dated: December 18, 2000.

#### Jim Golden,

Forest Supervisor.

[FR Doc. 01-399 Filed 1-5-01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

# **DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

## Natural Resources Conservation Service

# Notice of Proposed Changes to Section 4 of the Iowa State Technical Guide

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability of proposed changes in the Iowa NRCS

State Technical Guide for review and comment.

SUMMARY: It has been determined by the NRCS State Conservationist for Iowa that changes must be made in the NRCS State Technical Guide specifically in Section 4, Practice Standards and Specifications #590, Nutrient Management, to account for improved technology. This practice can be used in systems that treat highly erodible land.

DATES: Comments will be received on or before February 7, 2001.

## FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Leroy Brown, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Federal Building, 210 Walnut Street, 693 Federal Building, Des Moines, Iowa 50309; at 515/284–4260; fax 515/284– 4394.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section** 343 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 states that revisions made after enactment of the law to NRCS State technical guides used to carry out highly erodible land and wetland provisions of the law shall be made available for public review and comment. For the next 30 days the NRCS will receive comments relative to the proposed changes. Following that period a determination will be made by the NRCS regarding disposition of those comments and a final determination of change will be made.

Dated: December 26, 2000.

#### Dennis Pate,

Assistant State Conservationist-Technology. [FR Doc. 01–400 Filed 1–5–01; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3410–16–M

# BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

# Proposed Collection Reinstatement; Comment Request

SUMMARY: The Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on an information collection titled, "Interviews and Other Audience Research for Radio and TV Marti". This request for comment is being made pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 [Public Law 104–13; 44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)].

The information collection activity involved with this program is conducted pursuant to the mandate given to the BBG (formerly the United States Information Agency) in accordance with Public Law 98–11, the

Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, dated, October 4, 1983, to provide for the broadcasting of accurate information to the people of Cuba and for other purposes. This act was then amended by Pub. Law 101–246, dated, February 16, 1990, which established the authority for TV Marti.

**DATES:** Comments are due on or before March 9, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The Agency Clearance Officer, Ms. Jeannette Giovetti, BBG, M/AO, Room 1657A–1, 330 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20237, telephone (202) 205–9692, e-mail address JGiovett@IBB.GOV; or OMB Desk Officer for BBG, Mr. David Rostker, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Docket Library, Room 10202, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone (202) 395–3897.

Copies: Copies of the Request for Clearance (OMB 83–I), supporting statement, and other documents that will be submitted to OMB for approval may be obtained from the BBG Clearance Officer.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Public reporting burden for this proposed collection of information is estimated to average .11 hours per response (6.6 minutes), including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Responses are voluntary and respondents will be required to respond only one time. Comments are requested on the proposed information collection concerning:

- (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility:
- (b) The accuracy of the Agency's burden estimates;
- (c) Ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information collected; and
- (d) Ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on the respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information to the Agency Clearance Officer, Ms. Jeannette Giovetti, BBG, M/AO, Room 1657A–1, 330 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20237, telephone (202) 205–9692, e-mail address JGiovett@IBB.GOV; or to the OMB Desk

Officer for BBG, Mr. David Rostker, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, New Executive Office Building, Docket Library, Room 10202, NEOB, Washington, DC 20503, Telephone (202) 395–3897.

Current Actions: The BBG is requesting reinstatement of this collection for a three-year period and approval for a revision to the burden hours.

*Title:* Interviews and Other Audience Research for Radio and TV Marti.

Abstract: Data from this information collection are used by BBG's Office of Cuba Broadcasting (OCB) in fulfillment of its mandate to evaluate effectiveness of Radio and TV Marti operations by estimating the audience size and composition for broadcasts; and assess signal reception, credibility and relevance of programming through this research.

Proposed Frequency of Responses: Number of Respondents—4880. Recordkeeping Hours—.11. Total Annual Burden—560.

Dated: January 2, 2001.

## Dennis D. Sokol,

Director of Administration. [FR Doc. 01–450 Filed 1–5–01; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 8610–01–U

## **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

International Trade Administration [A-570-846]

Brake Rotors From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results and Partial Rescission of the Fourth New Shipper Review and Rescission of the Third Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results and partial rescission of fourth new shipper review and rescission of third antidumping duty administrative review.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce is currently conducting the fourth new shipper review and third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on brake rotors from the People's Republic of China covering the period April 1, 1999, through March 31, 2000. The fourth new shipper review covers two exporters. The Department of Commerce is preliminarily rescinding in part the fourth new shipper review with respect to one exporter. We have